

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 030770
Application No.: 10/606,219

REMARKS

Claims 10-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 10 and 12 are herein amended. Claims 14 and 15 are newly added. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walsh** (US 5,952,943) in view of **Umeda** (US 7,174,091). Favorable reconsideration is requested.

(1) Applicant respectfully submits that Walsh in view of Umeda does not teach or suggest:

a determiner for determining whether or not a decoding process of the encoded image components for one frame is completed by said decoder when the plurality of encoded image components equal to the compressed still images for a next frame are received by said receiver

as recited in claim 10; and

determining whether or not a decoding process of the encoded image components for one frame is completed in said decoding step when the plurality of encoded image components equal to the compressed still images for a next frame are received by said receiver

as recited in claim 12.

The Office Action acknowledges that Walsh does not teach a “determining” step and a “controlling” step as recited in claim 12 and Walsh does not disclose a “determiner” and “controller” capable of performing the recited functions. (Office Action, pages 3-4.) The Office Action cites Umeda for teaching these features.

Umeda discloses calculating the delay amount of the frames that are sequentially reproduced, and if and when the calculated delay amount reaches the threshold value, processes

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 030770
Application No.: 10/606,219

such as the filtering process are skipped. That is, in Umeda, the process for skipping is adjusted on the basis of the time embedded in the frame.

By contrast, in the present invention as recited in the claims, it is determined whether or not the decoding process is completed when the next frame is received, and if “NO,” the encoded image will be decoded with low resolution. Therefore, it is unnecessary in the present invention as recited in the claims to embed the time information in the frames and thus to interpret the time information. Umeda does not teach or suggest the determiner or determining step as recited in the claims.

(2) Applicant respectfully submits that Walsh in view of Umeda does not teach or suggest:

a controller for controlling a decoding amount by decoding said plurality of encoded image components except for at least a portion of encoded image components corresponding to high frequency components in said decoding process of the encoded image components for one frame when said determiner determines that said decoding process has not been completed;

as recited in amended claim 10; and

controlling a decoding amount by decoding said plurality of encoded image components except for at least a portion of encoded image components corresponding to high frequency components in said decoding process of the encoded image components for one frame when it is determined in said determining step that said decoding process has not been completed

as recited in amended claim 12.

Claims 10 and 12 have been amended to recite that the controller controls a decoding amount by decoding said plurality of encoded image components except for at least a portion of

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 030770
Application No.: 10/606,219

encoded image components corresponding to high frequency components. Support for the amendment is in the specification at, *e.g.*, pages 4-5.

The Office Action acknowledges that Walsh does not teach a controller as recited in the claims. (Office Action, pages 3-4.) The Office Action cites Umeda for teaching the recited controller.

Umeda discloses that if a delay is detected in the reproduction process and this delay reaches a certain threshold, then the controller may terminate processing and skip a frame. (Col. 9, lines 10-45.)

However, in the present invention as recited in the amended claims, the controller does not skip frames. Claims 10 and 12 recite that the controller decodes the plurality of encoded image components except for at least a portion of the encoded image components corresponding to high frequency components. Thus, Umeda does not disclose a controller or a controlling step as recited in amended claims 10 and 12.

New Claims

Claims 14 and 15 recite that the mode setter fixes the reproduction of the encoded image components in a high image quality mode or a low image quality mode and that the controller controls the decoding amount based on the mode fixed by the mode setter. Support for the new claims is in the specification at, *e.g.*, pages 5-6 and Fig. 3, S11. Neither Walsh nor Umeda discloses a mode setter for fixing the image quality mode in a high image quality mode or a low image quality mode.

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 030770
Application No.: 10/606,219

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 10-15 are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-13 is hereby solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Andrew G. Melick
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,868
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/adp/mra